



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

FLYNN et al

Atty. Ref.: JRL-550-466

Serial No. 10/691,501

TC/A.U.: 2189

Filed: October 23, 2003

Examiner: Dinh, Ngoc V.

For: HARDWARE DRIVEN STATE SAVE/RESTORE IN A DATA
PROCESSING SYSTEM

* * * * *

November 2, 2007

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated October 30, 2007,
Applicants file the following remarks.

The notice from the PTO indicates that “the summary of claimed subject matter section does not map the independent claims on appeal to the specification by page and line number into the drawings, if any (claims 1 and 13).” Applicants respectfully disagree.


Attention is drawn to the bottom of page 3 through the top of page 5 which provides an explicit “mapping of independent claim 1 onto an example, non-limiting embodiment in the specification.” Indeed, a review of the table on pages 4 and 5 shows independent claim 1 being mapped to the specification by page and line number and to the figures. Moreover, at the top of page 5, Applicants specifically state “because

independent method claim is the method analog of apparatus claim 1, the mapping provided for claim 1 also applies to independent claim 13.” The Appeal Brief is compliant with the rules. Substantive consideration of the brief is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100